



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,187	03/01/2004	Freddie W. Smith	MI40-360	3185

21567 7590 01/04/2007
WELLS ST. JOHN P.S.
601 W. FIRST AVENUE, SUITE 1300
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

LEE, BENJAMIN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/791,187

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin C. Lee

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response To Amendment

Claim Status

1. Claims 1-85 are pending.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph

2. Claims 83-84 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite:
 - 1) In claim 83, "the impedance reduction conductor" lacks antecedent basis.
 - 2) Claim 84 is similarly rejected due to dependency on rejected claim 83.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 4-5, 6-8, 11-12, 14-15, 17, 22, 24, 26-29, 31-35, 37-38, 40-44, 46-60, 62, 64, 73-74, 76-82 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over O'Toole et al. (US 6130602) in view of Marsh et al. and Gegan (US 4692769).

1) Claims 1 and 11: O'Toole et al. discloses the claimed remote communication device (12) comprising: communication circuitry configured to at least one of receive communication signals and generate communication signals; and an antenna (14; or 44, 46) coupled with the communication circuitry and configured to communicate wireless signals corresponding to the communication signals including at least one of receiving wireless signals and outputting wireless signals (Figs. 4-5; col. 41, lines 8-37; col. 42, lines 37-47); except the claimed wherein the antenna being configured to simultaneously communicate a plurality of substantially resonant frequencies.

While O'Toole et al. discloses that the RFID transponder (12) response to a plurality of frequencies centered about the 2.44 GHz frequency in backscatter communication in a frequency

Art Unit: 2612

hopping manner so as to reduce the amount of time the interrogator continuously uses a single frequency in view of FCC regulatory requirements advantages, Marsh et al. teaches a known dual band RFID transponder system in which the transponder responds to the dual band frequencies simultaneously (Abstract), and Gegan teaches a known dual frequency band micro-strip antenna that can communicate dual band tuned frequencies simultaneously (Abstract, Summary, Figures; col. 3, line 4). In view of the teachings by O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to employ a known dual band antenna operation such as taught by Marsh et al. and Gegan in a system such as taught by O'Toole et al. to differentiate the system's communication signals from other systems', e.g. noise, in applications where FCC regulation requirements do not prohibit simultaneous frequency-band use or special permissions granted.

2) Regarding claim 4, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, including: the claimed power source coupled with the communication circuitry (Figs. 1-4 of O'Toole et al.)

3) Claim 12: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed remote communication device according to claim 11, including the claimed wherein the antenna is substantially tuned to the resonant frequencies (col. 3, lines 4-5 of Gegan.)

4) Regarding claim 14, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 11, including: the claimed wherein the antenna is configured to receive the wireless signals, and further comprising another antenna coupled with the communication circuitry and configured to output the wireless signals at a plurality of

Art Unit: 2612

substantially resonant frequencies (separate transmitter and receiver antennas shown in Fig. 5 of O'Toole et al.)

5) Regarding claim 15, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 14, including: the claimed where in the another antenna is configured to communicate via backscatter modulation (backscatter communication of O'Toole et al.)

6) Regarding claim 5, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, plus the consideration of claim 14.

7) Regarding claim 6, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 5, plus the consideration of claim 15.

8) Regarding claim 7, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 5, wherein it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to include a quarter wave transmission line between the antenna and the circuitry as a connection means for improved gain for antenna performance.

9) Regarding claims 22 and 76, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 14.

10) Regarding claim 24, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 22, plus the consideration of claim 15.

11) Regarding claim 28, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 26, plus the consideration of claim 14.

Art Unit: 2612

12) Regarding claim 29, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 28, plus the consideration of claim 15.

13) Regarding claims 40-41, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 38, plus the consideration of claim 5.

14) Regarding claims 46-47, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 44, plus the consideration of claim 14.

15) Claim 17: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed remote communication device according to claim 11, including the claimed RFID circuitry (Figs. 4-5 of O'Toole et al.)

16) Claim 8: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, plus the consideration of claim 17.

17) Regarding claims 26-27, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claims 12 and 17.

18) Regarding claims 31, 34 and 37, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 26.

19) Regarding claims 32-33, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 31, plus the consideration of claim 27.

20) Regarding claim 35, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 34, plus the consideration of claim 28.

21) Claim 38: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2612

22) Claims 42-43: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 38, including: the claimed processing wireless signals using the remote communication device and said providing comprises providing an RFID device (Figs. 4-5 of O'Toole et al. and consideration of claim 8).

23) Regarding claim 44, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 11.

24) Claims 48-49: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 44, including: the claimed processing wireless signals using the remote communication device and said providing comprises providing an RFID device (consideration of claim 17).

25) Regarding claims 50 and 52, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 26, plus see Abstract and disclosure corresponding to Figs. 4-5 of O'Toole et al.

26) Regarding claim 51, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 50, plus the consideration of claim 28 or 14.

27) Regarding claim 53, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 50, plus see Abstract and disclosure corresponding to Fig. 4 of O'Toole et al. in which the receiving and transmitting use the same antenna and carrier frequencies.

28) Regarding claims 54-56, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 22, including: the claimed wherein the forward link signal from the interrogator is at one of the plurality of frequencies (backscatter

Art Unit: 2612

communication as established in the combine teachings requires the interrogator to generate such plural frequency bands for backscatter/reflection by the transponder.)

29) Regarding claim 57, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 11.

30) Regarding claim 58, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 57, plus the obviousness consideration of claim 4.

31) Claim 59: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 57, plus the consideration of claim 17.

32) Regarding claim 60, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 57, plus the consideration of claim 5.

33) Regarding claim 62, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claim 24, plus the consideration of claims 54-56, wherein:

--the claimed outputting a continuous wave signal... are met by the "backscatter" communication steps involved between the interrogator and the transponder.

34) Regarding claim 64, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, plus the consideration of claim 4, and:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to implement the resonant type transponder antenna of O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan. using a loop antenna, and furthermore to center the power source/battery with respect to the loop antenna as a matter of structural layout design for improved packaging, since the center of the loop antenna is space available for other components including the power source.

Art Unit: 2612

35) Claim 73: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1.

36) Regarding 74, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 11, plus the consideration of claim 62 regarding the claimed wherein the device antenna is configured to communicate at different substantially resonant frequencies corresponding to interrogation signals having different carrier frequencies.

37) Regarding claim 77, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 26 including:

--the claimed wherein the frequencies comprise carrier frequencies of the forward and return signals (backscatter communication considered in claim 11.)

38) Regarding claim 78, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 31, including:

--the claimed wherein the frequencies comprise carrier frequencies of the forward and return signals (backscatter communication considered in claim 11.)

39) Claim 79: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 38, wherein the frequencies/bands do not overlap (dual band).

40) Regarding claim 80, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 44, including:

--the claimed different carrier frequencies (dual band frequencies considered in claim 11.)

41) Regarding claim 81, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, including: the claimed wherein the communication circuitry is configured to control reflection, by the antenna, of electromagnetic energy present at

Art Unit: 2612

the remote communication device to implement backscatter communications (Figs. 4-5 and backscatter communication of O'Toole et al.)

42) Regarding claim 82, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 4, including: the claimed wherein the power source is a battery (Figs. 1-5 of O'Toole et al.)

43) Regarding claim 85, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious the claimed subject matter as in claim 31, including: the claimed wherein the interrogator is configured to output a continuous wave signal and the remote communication device is configured to backscatter modulate the continuous wave signal to output the return signals (backscatter communication of O'Toole et al.)

4. Claims 2-3, 13, 18-20, 23, 39, 45 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al. in view of Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami.

1) Regarding claim 13, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 11, except: the claimed wherein the antenna is configured to electromagnetically communicate with a return loss of less than or equal to approximately -9 dB at the first and second frequencies.

While O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan teaches a transponder conducting backscattering communication using multiple antenna resonant frequencies using a microstrip antenna, Murakami discloses using an antenna (microstrip/patch antenna according to Figs. 1a-1b) having multiple resonant frequencies (f_1 , f_2 , f_3) with corresponding return losses of about -10dB, -15 dB, -10 dB, respectively (Fig. 6); which meets the claimed limitation.

Art Unit: 2612

In view of the teachings of O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to implement the antenna in O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan to have a low return loss characteristic such as taught by Murakami, since low return loss is generally desired for an antenna in a communication device for optimal signal, range, or power considerations, especially for a low/limited power type transponder such as taught by O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan.

2) Regarding claims 2-3, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, plus the consideration of claim 13 in view of Murakami.

3) Regarding claim 18, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claims 13 and 17.

4) Regarding claim 19, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 18, plus the consideration of claim 14.

5) Regarding claim 20, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 19, plus the consideration of claim 15.

6) Regarding claim 23, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 22, plus the consideration of claim 13 in view of Murakami.

7) Claim 39: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 38, plus the consideration of claim 3 (or 13) in view of Murakami.

8) Claim 45: O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 44, plus the consideration of claim 13 in view of Murakami.

Art Unit: 2612

9) Regarding claim 75, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 18, including:

--the claimed different carrier frequencies of the communication signals (dual band frequencies involved in backscattering communication.)

5. Claims 9-10, 16, 25, 30, 36, 61 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan as in claim 1, further in view of Kodukala et al. (US pat. 6,215,402).

1) Regarding claim 9, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, except:

--specifying the claimed wherein the frequency bands are centered at approximately 915 MHz. and 2.45 GHz.

However, Kodukala et al. discloses that 915 MHz. and 2.45 GHz. are two of the frequencies conventionally known and used for RFID communication (col. 5, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to choose the frequency bands in O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan so that they are centered at approximately 915 MHz and 2.45 GHz. since these are frequencies used in known RFID protocols.

2) Regarding claim 16, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 11, except:

--specifying the claimed wherein the antenna includes an impedance reduction conductor.

However, Kodukala et al. teaches the known use of an impedance matching method for (patch) antenna in RFID communication using an impedance matching (including reduction)

Art Unit: 2612

conductor (Fig. 2A and col. 5, line 40 and col. 6, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to include an impedance reduction conductor in the antenna as taught by Kodukala et al. in a transponder as taught by O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan to match the impedance for improved performance of the RFID communications.

3) Regarding claim 10, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 1, plus the consideration of claim 16 in view of Kodukala et al.

4) Regarding claim 25, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 22, plus the consideration of claim 16 further in view of Kodukala et al.

5) Regarding claim 30, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 26, plus the consideration of claim 16 in view of Kodukala et al.

6) Regarding claim 36, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 35, plus the consideration of claim 25 (or 16) further in view of Kodukala et al.

7) Regarding claim 61, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 57, plus the consideration of claim 10 in view of Kodukala et al.

8) Regarding claim 83, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan and Kodukala et al. render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 9, plus the consideration of claim 16,

Art Unit: 2612

wherein the impedance matching/reduction conductor is connected to the antenna element and thus tunes the frequency bands

9) Regarding claim 84, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan and Kodulkala et al. render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 83, wherein it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention that the concept of impedance matching/reduction via a conductor connected to the antenna element in O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Kodulkala et al. is applicable to dipole antennas used with RFID tags as well, by coupling the impedance reduction conductor with the dipole antenna including one half of the dipole antenna.

6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan, and further in view of Murakami and Kodulkala et al.

1) Regarding claim 21, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 18, plus the consideration of claim 16 further in view of Kodukala et al.

7. Claims 65, 68-69 and 71-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan, and further in view of Cook et al. (US pat. 5,320,561).

1) Regarding claim 65, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claims 11 and 4, while:

Cook et al. teaches the known loading/tuning effect of a battery on a nearby antenna and the need for taking such effect into account when regarding antenna parameters (col. 1, lines 52-55; col. 4, line 57 to col. 5, line 14).

Art Unit: 2612

In view of their teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to take into account the tuning/loading effect of the battery on the nearby antenna (co-located on a small area of the transponder) when providing the intended frequencies/bands in such design in O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan, since such tuning/loading effect has been known in the art as taught by Cook et al.

2) Regarding claim 68, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 26, plus the consideration of claim 65 in view of Cook et al.

3) Regarding claim 69, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 38, plus the consideration of claim 65 in view of Cook et al.

4) Regarding claim 71, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 54, plus the consideration of claim 65 further in view of Cook et al.

5) Regarding claim 72, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 57, plus the consideration of claim 65 in view of Cook et al.

8. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Kodulkala et al., and further in view of Cook et al.

1) Regarding claim 70, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 44, plus the consideration of claim 1, the consideration of claim 16 in view of Kodulkala et al., and the consideration of claim 65 in view of Cook et al.

9. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan, and Murakami, and further in view of Cook et al.

Art Unit: 2612

1) Regarding claim 66, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al., Gegan and Murakami render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 18, plus the consideration of claim 65 further in view of Cook et al.

10. Claims 63 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan, and further in view of Moskowitz et al. (US pat. #5,528,222) and Cook et al.

1) Regarding claim 63, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in the consideration of claims 1 and 4;

while:

a) Moskowitz et al. teaches the known placement of a battery in the center of the loop antenna for efficient packaging (Fig. 8); and

b) Cook et al. teaches the known loading/tuning effect of a battery on a nearby antenna and the need for taking such effect into account when regarding antenna parameters (col. 1, lines 52-55; col. 4, line 57 to col. 5, line 14).

In view of these teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to center the battery relative to the loop antenna as taught by Moskowitz et al. in a transponder of O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan for improved packaging efficiency, while taking into account the tuning/loading effect of the battery on the antenna when providing the intended frequencies/bands in such design, since such tuning/loading effect has been known in the art as taught by Cook et al.

Art Unit: 2612

2) Regarding claim 67, O'Toole et al., Marsh et al. and Gegan render obvious all of the claimed subject matter as in claim 22, plus the consideration of 63 further in view of Moskowitz et al. and Cook et al.

Response To Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 10/2/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1) Motivation for the complete rejection of the previous Office action has been included in the detail Office action rejection as part of the consideration of the claims.

2) The arguments directed to the amended feature concerning the "simultaneous" of the first and second frequency bands are moot since the amended claims have been rejected under new grounds of rejection as necessitated by the amendment. See above rejection for detail.

3) In conclusion, Applicants arguments are not deemed persuasive in overcoming the above new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1) US 5182570: A well-known use of quarter-wave transmission line between antenna (one or both side of dipole) and transponder circuitry (Figs. 1-3.)

2) US 6037907, 5561435: Other known dual band antennas.

3) US 5467099: Resonant antenna using a similar enlarged conductor portion for impedance matching (col. 7, lines 15-18.)

4) US 6028564: A similar impedance optimized antenna using conductor segments.

Art Unit: 2612

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin C. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2963. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Thu 11:00Am-7:30Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Benjamin C. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2612

B.L.